

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Applicants submit amended Figures 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 20 and 23 to replace the Figures 2-3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 15, 20 and 23 currently on file. Each drawing sheet submitted herewith is labeled "Replacement Sheet" in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.121.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of the Claims

The present amendment and response is filed in response to the Office Action mailed April 14, 2006. In the present amendment, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 13, 15-17, 26, 36, 42, 43, 45, 60, 61, 63, 64, and 70 are amended, claims 3, 7-10, 14, 20, 22, 23, 27, 28, 30, 31, 38-41, 48-59, 65, 69, and 71 are cancelled, new claims 72-98 have been added and claims 6, 12, 18, 19, 21, 25, 29, 33-35, 37, 44, 46, 47, 62, and 66-68 remain as filed. Following entry of this amendment, claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-13, 15-19, 21, 25-26, 29, 32-37, 42-47, 60-64, 66-68, 70, and 72-98 will be pending.

Claim 1 has been amended so as to be drawn to a robotic platform having at least three corners and including at least two locomotion members with their respective driving wheels being pivotally mounted about a respective corner. The locomotion members are pivotable along at least one plane about said corner with respect to the robotic platform body. The terms “adjustment bolt”, “work reducing means”, “pivot controlling means”, “pivoting actuator”, “its”, and “type” have been deleted. The term “steering controller” has been replaced by “locomotion controller” since a “locomotion controller” comprises a “steering controller” (see paragraph 00155). The term “frame support” has been amended to read “support frame”. Applicants also add new claims 93-98 which are drawn to a modular locomotion member mountable to a robotic platform. Applicants submit that the amendments and new claim introduce no new matter.

Amendments to the Drawings

The drawings have been amended to overcome the objections recited in the Office action. Specifically: Figure 2 has been amended in order to add reference numeral 30 (frame), to delete reference numeral 40 and to interchange reference numerals 314 and 52. Figure 3 has been amended in order to add reference numeral 30”. Figure 5 has been amended in order to delete reference numeral 97”. Figure 7 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral 110 whose leading line designates a worm gear with reference numeral 186” The formerly unknown components of Figure 7 respectively labeled 114

and not marked have now been designated with reference numeral 110 since they are connecting elements and form part of the mounting assembly (110). Figure 8 has been amended in order to delete reference numeral 124. Figure 10 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral 178 with reference numeral 148". Figure 15 has been amended in order to delete reference numeral 214. Figure 20 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral 308 with reference numeral 336". Figure 23 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral 316 with reference numeral 314".

Applicants submit herewith a full set of drawings labeled "Replacement Sheet" incorporating the amendments. Applicants also submit marked-up copies of the amended sheets, showing the changes relative to the originally submitted drawings. Applicants submit that the amendments to the drawings introduce no new matter. In view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the drawings are in compliance with 37 CFR1.121(d). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicants amend the specification to overcome the objections recited in the Office action. Specifically: Page 12 paragraph 0074 line 3 has been amended in order to replace the term "central controller 312" with "central control system 312". Page 12 paragraph 0074 lines 4-5 has been amended in order to delete the expression "body 12 includes a communication" and to insert in its place "central" as well as "is" between "control system 312" and "secured to the iron angles 32". Page 13 paragraph 0079 line 1 has been amended in order to insert "(i.e. mounting plate)" after "cover plate 70". Page 16 paragraph 0094 line 1 has been amended in order to delete the reference numeral "22". Page 16 paragraph 0096 line 1 has has been amended in order to delete the reference numeral "22". Page 19 paragraph 00108 line 3 has been amended in order to delete the expression "An intermediate gear 195 directly mounted unto straight gear allow coupling the" and to insert in its place "The intermediate" as well as to insert "is coupled" between "worm gear 188" and "to the straight gear 192." Page 21 paragraph 00114 line 4 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral "198" with reference numeral "196".

Pages 27-28 paragraph 00146 line 5 has been amended in order replace reference numeral “322” with reference numeral “312”. Page 29 paragraph 00154 line 1 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral “398” with reference numeral “306”. Page 30 paragraph 00161 line 7 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral “338” with reference numeral “302”. Page 34 paragraph 00185 line 1 has been amended in order to replace reference numeral “316” with reference numeral “314”.

Applicants submit herewith a full corrected copy of the specification labeled “Replacement Sheet” incorporating the amendments. Applicants also submit marked-up copies of the amended sheets, showing the changes relative to the originally submitted specification. Applicants submit that the amendments to the specification introduce no new matter. In view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that the specification is appropriately corrected. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections.

Claim Objections

Applicants amend claims 8, 9, 15 and 36 to overcome the objections recited in the Office action. In view of the amendments and the above comments describing the amendments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the objections.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §112

In the Office action, claims 14, 27, 28 and 42-70 were rejected under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 14, 27, 28 and 42-70 obviate the rejections. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Further, claims 4, 7, 13, 14, 63 and 64 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicants regard as the invention. Applicants submit that the

amendments to claims 4, 7, 13, 14, 63 and 64 obviate the rejections. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of the claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § § 102 & 103

In the outstanding Office Action:

1. Claims 1-7, 9-11, 18-20, 24-29 and 32-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Fletcher et al. (US Patent No. 3,730,287) (“Fletcher”);
2. Claims 42-45 and 48-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Torrie et al. (US Patent Publication No. 2002/0023788) (“Torrie”);
3. Claims 12, 13 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher in view of Boivin et al. (US Patent No. 6,874,586) (“Boivin”);
4. Claims 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher in view of Boivin; and
5. Claims 21-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fletcher in view of Kadonoff et al. (US Patent No. 4,751,658).

It is respectfully submitted that amended independent claim 1 is allowable at least for the reason that the references cited by the Examiner, taken separately or in combination, fail to teach or anticipate a robotic platform with track members being mounted about the corners thereof and being pivotable relative to the body of the robotic platform. Therefore, Applicants contend that claim 1 as amended is now patentably distinct over the cited prior art. Claims 2-92 are ultimately dependent on claim 1 and as such are also believed to be patentable.

Fletcher does not use a track mounted to a driving wheel and a driven wheel so that they may be driven in unison which renders the Fletcher locomotion member vulnerable to obstacles on the ground. In Fletcher, the propulsion unit is mounted to an extended leg that is coupled to the side of the frame of the vehicle. In the instant application, the

driving wheel of the track is mounted to a corner of the frame (or body) of the vehicle. Therefore, Lyon fails to describe or suggest a robotic platform with track members being mounted about the corners thereof and being pivotable relative to the body of the robotic platform.

Torrie teaches a locomotion member wherein the propulsion member is positioned in the centre of the track and connected to the side of the frame. In the instant invention the propulsion member or driving wheel is positioned at an end of the track and mounted to the body (frame) at a corner thereof. Therefore, Torrie fails to describe or suggest a robotic platform with track members being mounted about the corners thereof and being pivotable relative to the body of the robotic platform.

In Boivin, the endless tacks are not configured to change direction. The tracks are mounted beneath the vehicle via extended legs and not about a corner of the body of the vehicle as in the instant application. Therefore, Boivin fails to describe or suggest a robotic platform with track members being mounted about the corners thereof and being pivotable relative to the body of the robotic platform.

Kardanoff is drawn to a system comprising sensors for avoiding obstacles along a path and not a robotic platform. Therefore, Kardanoff fails to describe or suggest a robotic platform with track members being mounted about the corners thereof and being pivotable relative to the body of the robotic platform.

In view of the above comments, it is respectfully submitted that none of the cited references, taken separately or in combination, discloses the subject matter of amended independent claim 1. Therefore, independent claim 1 is believed to be allowable as well as the dependent claims directly or indirectly dependent thereon.



CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing arguments, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all grounds of rejection, and allowance of claims 1-2, 4-6, 11-13, 15-19, 21, 25-26, 29, 32-37, 42-47, 60-64, 66-68, 70, and 72-98 in due course. The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone at the number listed below to discuss any outstanding issues.

Date: October 16, 2006
Reg. No. 54,089

Tel. No.: (617) 261-3189
Fax No.: (617) 261-3175

BOS-1016830 v1

Respectfully submitted,

James E. Fajkowski
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Kirkpatrick & Lockhart Nicholson
Graham LLP
State Street Financial Center
One Lincoln Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02111-2950